

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application. The Office Action mailed June 30, 2006 tentatively rejected claims 1-19. This is a full and timely response to that outstanding Office Action. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1-19 are pending. More specifically, claims 1 and 13 are amended. These amendments are specifically described hereinafter.

I. Present Status of Patent Application

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Wasilewski* (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,782). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

A. Claims 1-12

The Office Action rejects claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Wasilewski* (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,782). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A method for providing a plurality of programs in a conditional access system, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting for encryption a plurality of digital bit streams from a transport stream, the selecting performed using an identifier;

encrypting a portion of each of the plurality of digital bit streams;

combining the encrypted portion and the unencrypted portion with the transport stream; and

transmitting the combined stream.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 patently defines over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose the features emphasized above. For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. *See, e.g., E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 as amended is allowable for at least the reason that *Wasilewski* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of **selecting for encryption a plurality of digital bit streams from a transport stream, the selecting performed using an identifier**. Even if, *arguendo*, *Wasilewski* selects packets for transmission, it does not teach using an identifier to select streams for encryption. Therefore, *Wasilewski* does not anticipate independent claim 1, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Because independent claim 1 as amended is allowable over the cited references of record, dependent claims 2-12 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 2-12 contain all the steps/features of independent claim 1. *See Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002) *Jeneric/Pentron, Inc. v. Dillon Co.*, 205 F.3d 1377, 54 U.S.P.Q.2d 1086 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Wahpeton Canvas Co. v. Frontier Inc.*, 870 F.2d 1546, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Therefore, since dependent claims 2-12 are patentable over *Wasilewski*, the rejection to claims 2-12 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-12 recite further features and/or combinations of features, as are apparent by examination of the claims themselves, that are patently distinct from the cited references of record. Hence, there are other reasons why dependent claims 2-12 are allowable.

B. Claims 13-19

The Office Action rejects claims 13-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Wasilewski* (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,782). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 13, as amended, recites:

13. A method for providing a plurality of programs in a conditional access system, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting for encryption a plurality of elementary bit streams from a plurality of programs, the selecting performed using an identifier;

encrypting a portion of the selected streams;

combining the encrypted portion and the remaining portion of the selected streams with the plurality of programs to provide a partially-encrypted stream; and

transmitting the partially-encrypted stream.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 patently defines over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose the features emphasized above. For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 13 as amended is allowable for at least the reason that *Wasilewski* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of **selecting for encryption a plurality of elementary bit streams from a plurality of programs, the selecting performed using an identifier**. Even if, arguendo, *Wasilewski* selects packets for transmission, it does not teach using an identifier to select streams for encryption. Therefore, *Wasilewski* does not anticipate independent claim 13, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Because independent claim 13 as amended is allowable over the cited references of record, dependent claims 14-19 (which depend from independent claim

13) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 14-19 contain all the steps/features of independent claim 13. Therefore, since dependent claims 14-19 are patentable over *Wasilewski*, the rejection to claims 14-19 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of independent claim 13, dependent claims 14-19 recite further features and/or combinations of features, as are apparent by examination of the claims themselves, that are patently distinct from the cited references of record. Hence, there are other reasons why dependent claims 14-19 are allowable.

III. Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1 and 13 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1 and 13 of copending Application No. 10/602,986. As this is a provisional rejection, Applicant will submit a terminal disclaimer upon indication of otherwise allowable subject matter, assuming such is still needed at that point.

IV. Miscellaneous Issues

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his indication that the submitted IDS is allegedly improper. Applicant is currently considering resubmission of the IDS. Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1-19 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/BAB/

Benjamin A. Balser, Reg. No. 58,169

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500